

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 9, 2006. At that time, claims 1-24 were pending. In the Office Action, claims 7-12, 15, 23, and 24 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the previously imposed restriction requirement. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings and objected to claim 1. Claims 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,813,696 issued to Hill (hereinafter "Hill"). However, claims 1-6, 13-14, and 16-19 were allowed.

By this paper, claims 1, 13, 19, 20, and 22 have been amended. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

I. Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show the features found in claims 13, 19, 22, and 24. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the following types of airbags were not shown in the drawings: "steering wheel-mounted driver's side airbag cushions," "overhead airbag cushions," "pillar-mounted airbag cushions," "knee bolsters," and "inflatable curtain airbag cushions."

As a result of this paper, dependent claims 13, 19, and 22 have been amended to recite some particular examples of the claimed airbag cushion, such as for example, that the cushion is a "driver's side airbag cushion[]" or a "dashboard-mounted passenger's side airbag cushion[]." These particular types of airbag cushions are shown in the drawings. Specifically, Figures 6A-6C shows the driver's side airbag cushion and Figures 2-4 shows the dashboard-mounted passenger's side airbag cushion. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claim features have been shown in the drawings and that the drawings comport with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

It should be noted however, that this amendment is made to the form of these dependent claims and does not limit the scope of the independent claims (namely claims 1, 17, and 20) in any way. Specifically, these independent claims require an "airbag cushion." As taught by the Applicants, such airbag cushions may take on a variety of different forms and configurations. Particular examples of the types of airbag cushions are disclosed as follows:

One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the deployment restraint systems of the invention are suitable for use in a wide variety of airbag cushions, including, but not limited to, steering wheel-mounted driver's side airbag cushions, dashboard-mounted passenger's side airbag cushions; overhead airbag cushions; inflatable curtain airbag cushions; pillar-mounted airbag cushions; and knee bolsters.

Specification page 20, line 21-page 22, line 3. Thus, while the drawings may show particular embodiments—*i.e.*, the embodiments of a driver's side airbag cushion and a passenger side airbag cushion—it is clear that the claims are not limited to these particular embodiments. *See e.g., Electro Medical Systems S.A. v. Cooper Life Sciences Inc.*, 32 USPQ2d 1017, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (“[P]articular embodiments appearing in a specification will not be read into the claims when the claim language is broader than such embodiments”). Rather, the scope of independent claims 1, 17, and 20 is clear and cover all types of “airbag cushions,” including steering wheel-mounted driver's side airbag cushions, dashboard-mounted passenger's side airbag cushions, overhead airbag cushions, pillar-mounted airbag cushions, knee bolsters, inflatable curtain airbag cushions, and/or other types of airbag cushions.

II. Objection to Claim 1

The Examiner objected to claim 1 as containing improper grammar. In this paper, Applicants have amended this claim to correct this error. This amendment is a non-limiting amendment that is made to the form of the claims and does not, in any way, affect the scope of the claims. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 20-22 under § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill. With respect to these claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, as a result of this paper, claim 20 has been amended to recite that the limiting tether is attached to an intermediate portion of the reaction tether. As indicated in the Office Action, this feature is not taught by the prior art. *See* Office Action, p. 5. Accordingly, for this reason, claim 20 is allowable. With respect to dependent claims 21 and 22, these claims

Appl. No. 10/733,846
Response dated October 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2006

depend from independent claim 20 and are thus patentable over Hill for the same reasons outlined above. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: October 19, 2006
Autoliv ASP, Inc.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
Telephone: (801) 625-4994

S:\ALLCLIENTS\2949_Autoliv\2949.2.172\OAR1\2949.2.172ResponseTo09Mar06OfficeAction V02.doc